

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to Figs. 5 and 7. No new matter has been added.

Attachment:      Replacement sheets

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5 are pending and have been examined in the present application.

The objections to the drawings and specification are noted. In response, Applicants have amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner at pages 4-5 of the Office Action, amended drawings Figs. 5 and 7 to include different reference legends for these flowcharts, as well as amending the specification to note these different reference legends. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the each of claims 1-5 are in full compliance with all §112 requirements.

In particular, the Office Action states in paragraph 8.1.1 that these claims are indefinite because it is unclear how the claimed invention would operate if there were more than two network devices connected to the bus. This is clearly speculation. Especially because the specification explains how the claimed structure would operate in such a situation. If one of skill in the art had any doubt, they could simply refer to the specification at page 13, line 10 through page 14, line 13.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-5 are in full compliance with all §112 requirements.

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration of the amendments to the specification and drawings, and allowance of the present application with claims 1-5 is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Dated: June 1, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Richard LaCava/  
Richard LaCava

Registration No.: 41,135  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
41st Floor  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 277-6500  
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments